

## **REMARKS**

Claims 23, 26, 27, 34 and 36-38 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 23, 26-27, 34, and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,408,391 B1) ("Huff") in view of Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,692 B1) in further view of Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712 B1) ("Bastian"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 34 is amended to recite "...an onboard communication network accessible for use by a plurality of users onboard the mobile platform; an intrusion detection system onboard the mobile platform for monitoring use of the onboard network for detecting if a potential intrusion event has occurred by one of the plurality of users onboard the mobile platform; and an onboard security management system responsive to the intrusion detection system for initiating an action to address the potential intrusion event, based on a set of security policies, the action able to be directed to at least a selected one of a plurality of user access points on the onboard network, the set of security policies defining the action as initiatable subject to an override of the action through the terrestrial-based system and as changeable, when the intermittent link makes communication with the terrestrial-based system unavailable, to restore a previous policy-defined state of the selected user access point; and the onboard

security management system receives updates to said security policies from the terrestrial-based system when said intermittent link is operational...”

Huff describes two networks NET1 and NET2 of monitoring systems (500, 600) that operate on different frequencies. Each monitoring system (500, 600) can monitor the entire system if a service manager (260 or 260') in one monitoring system becomes disabled (col. 13, lines 44-46). Although Huff discloses wireless links, Huff does not discuss or even suggest intermittent links. (As known in the art, an intermittent link is not the same as intermittent communication, which can take place over a continuously available link.) The agents of Huff appear to be simply duplicative across duplicate systems (500, 600) and are not disclosed as being configured to react to an intermittent link. Further, it is admitted in the Office Action that “Huff does not explicitly state wherein the said security system communicates with a terrestrial-based system.”

Monroe describes a security system that uses audio and image signals to monitor aircraft (abstract). Monroe does not teach or suggest monitoring use of an onboard communication network available for use by aircraft passengers. Further, it is admitted in the Office Action that the combination of Huff and Monroe “fails to clearly render support as to that wireless link being an intermittent link.”

The aircraft communications system of Bastian is not disclosed as having any security monitoring capability relative to passenger use of the system. Neither Huff, Monroe, nor Bastian, each alone or in combination, teach or suggest “...an onboard security management system...for initiating an action to address the potential intrusion event, based on a set of security policies, the action able to be directed to...user access points on the onboard network, the set of security policies defining the action as

initiatable subject to an override of the action through the terrestrial-based system and as changeable, when the intermittent link makes communication with the terrestrial-based system unavailable, to restore a previous policy-defined state of the selected user access point” as recited in claim 34 as amended.

Claim 38 is amended to recite “... providing a plurality of network access points to users on the mobile platform, the access points capable of providing access by user devices to an onboard network configured to communicate with a terrestrial-based system over an intermittent link; monitoring the onboard network to detect an intrusion event made by at least one of the users on the mobile platform; using a security management system onboard the mobile platform, and responsive to notification of an intrusion event, initiating a security action to address the intrusion event, in accordance with a set of security policies, where the security action can be directed to one or more selected access points on the network; and indicating an operational status of the network, the operational status resulting from the initiated action when the intermittent link prevents communication with the terrestrial-based system, the set of security policies defining the status as changeable based on whether the intermittent link makes input from the terrestrial-based system available for transitioning the one or more selected user access points into an auto-response disabled state.”

As previously discussed, Huff does not discuss or suggest intermittent links. Further, it is admitted in the Office Action that the combination of Huff and Monroe “fails to clearly render support as to that wireless link being an intermittent link.” Still further, the aircraft communications system of Bastian is not disclosed as having any security monitoring capability relative to passenger use of the system. Neither Huff, Monroe, nor


Bastian, each alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recitations of claim 38 as amended. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 26-27, 34, and 36-38 should be allowed over the cited references.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 7, 2009

By:   
Elizabeth D. Odell, Reg. No. 39,532

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

EDO/nr

14665168.1